IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT JODHPUR.

O R D E R

Dinesh Trivedi. Versus State of Rajasthan & Anr.

S.B. Criminal Misc. Petition No. 347/2006

...

Dinesh Trivedi. Versus State of Rajasthan & Anr.

S.B. Criminal Misc. Petition No. 346/2006

and

Dinesh Trivedi. Versus State of Rajasthan & Anr.

S.B. Criminal Misc. Petition No. 397/2006

Date of Order: August 22, 2006

PRESENT

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.R. PANWAR

Mr. Vijay Purohit, for the petitioner.
Mr. Ashok Upadhyaya, Public Prosecutor for the State.

BY THE COURT:

By these three criminal miscellaneous petitions under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short,"the Code" hereinafter), the petitioner seeks quashing of FIRs No. 95/2005, 05/2006 and 07/2006, Police Station, Bagdi Nagar, district Pali, for the offences under Sections 467, 468,

471, 409, 420 and 379 IPC. In all the three FIRs, common questions of law and facts are involved and, therefore, with the consent of the learned counsel for the parties, these matters are being heard and decided together.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties. Carefully gone through th averments made in the First Information Reports.

The allegations against the present petitioner in all the three first information reports filed by the complainants are that the petitioner, being an employee of the Co-operative Societies of village Bagdi Nagar, is mainly dealing with the fertilizers, seeds and agricultural loans to the agriculturists and is under the control of the Pali Central Co-operative Bank Ltd., Pali. The petitioner is the Manager of the said society for grant of loans and during his tenure as the Manager, he committed criminal breach of trust for a sum of Rs.15 lac on various occasions, the details of which have been given in all the three FIRs, by forging the documents of valuable securities. On the Audit being held, it was revealed by various receipts mentioned in the FIRs and the Audit Report which have been forged by the petitioner, the petitioner committed embezzlement of a sum of more than Rs. 15 lac. Keeping in view these facts, in my opinion, no case for quashing the FIRs is made out. The victims, whose documents have been forged and the money

have been drawn by the petitioner, have lodged the complaints and, therefore, in my view, no case for quashing the FIRs is made out, as also, no case for consolidating the FIRs is made out.

All the three criminal miscellaneous petitions, being devoid of any merit, are dismissed.

(H.R. PANWAR), J.

mcs